

housing 22 is not indicative of an insulating material. Applicant agrees with the Examiner to the extent that the objection is directed to the hatch lines of the housing 22, but believes that the objection should have been directed to Figures 2-4. Applicant submits herewith three copies of Figures 2-4 marked in red ink thereon reflecting that the housing 22 is an insulating material. Approval of these drawing change as well as the withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourdon et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 22 recite an electrical connector having, *inter alia*, a dielectric housing having a plurality of substantially open receptacles arranged in an array, a plurality of electrically conductive contacts positioned within at least some of said receptacles, a plurality of retention members within the receptacle, at least one of said retention members engaging at least one of said contacts so as to impart an ungapped condition to the connector at the location of the retention member within the housing.

Bourdon et al. discloses an electrical connector with insertable and removable contacts. Specifically, Bourdon et al. discloses a connector 1 having one (Fig. 10) or two (Fig. 1) contact inserts 10. The contact insert has a plurality of passages 15 for receiving contacts 20 therein. Each of the passages has a plurality of retention fingers 11 integral with the insert 10 for retaining the contacts 20 to the insert 10. ***The retention fingers 11 do not create an ungapped condition to the connector. Rather, in order to create an ungapped condition, a forward moisture sealing grommet 40 and a rear moisture sealing grommet 30 is required.*** Thus, Bourdon et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, an electrical connector having “retention members engaging at least one of said contacts so as to impart an ungapped condition to the connector at the location of the retention member within the housing.” Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourdon et al. for at least the above reason. As claims 2-21 and 23-27 are ultimately dependent on either independent claim 1 or 22, claims 2-21 and 23-27 are likewise not unpatentable over Bourdon et al. for at least the above

reason. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-21 and 23-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourdon et al.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections in view of the corrected drawings and in light of the above comments, and approval of the drawings and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conversation would facilitate prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: October 5, 2001

By: Robert J. Zeitler
Robert J. Zeitler
Registration No. 37,973
Attorney of Record

Mailing Address:
Robert J. Zeitler
MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-4884
Fax.: (630) 416-4962